

# Evaluation of Support and Ground Response as Longwall Face Advances into and Widens Pre-Driven Recovery Room

**Thomas M. Barczak**, Senior Research Engineer  
**Stephen C. Tadolini**, Chief, Rock Safety Engineering Branch  
NIOSH-Pittsburgh Research Laboratory  
Pittsburgh, PA

**Peter (Yunqing) Zhang**, Sr. Geotechnical Engineer  
Pennsylvania Services Corporation (affiliate of Foundation Coal)  
Waynesburg, PA

## ABSTRACT

A cooperative study was conducted with Emerald Coal Resources, L.P., an affiliate of Foundation Coal Corporation, and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to evaluate the effectiveness of (partially) pre-driven longwall recovery rooms supported with pumpable roof supports. This paper evaluates the load transfer mechanics associated with the advancement of the longwall face into the pre-driven recovery room and the widening of the room to recover the longwall shields. The results show that the yielding of the panel fender produced uncontrollable convergence that caused yielding of the shields and stiff pumpable roof supports when the face was approximately 10 ft from the recovery room. The shields continued to yield until the face advanced into the recovery room. Convergence in the pre-driven recovery room typically reached 6-8 in once the pumpable supports yielded and shed load through a declining residual load capacity prior to being cut out by the longwall shearer. Roof deformations occurred beyond the 32-ft horizon with total deformation ranging from 2 to 4 in, indicating that standing support was necessary to help control the span as the longwall face advanced into the pre-driven recovery room. Stability improved as the pumpable supports were cut out, thereby reducing the span between the shields and the outby pillars. In the end, the shields were successfully recovered under stable ground conditions. However, a disconcerting discovery was the load shedding of the outby pillars as the recovery room was mined into. It is postulated that this may be due to the progression of the rear "abutment" moving toward the recovery room as the panel fender and standing support in the recovery room yield and shed load. This behavior was not expected with a relatively narrow room that is fully supported with standing support. If this mechanism is indeed occurring, the width of the room and performance of the standing support becomes even more critical. Premature failure of the support can lead to excessive convergence on the shield line that cannot be controlled even with modern shields, resulting in roof instabilities that can lead to catastrophic results.

## INTRODUCTION

Pre-driven recovery rooms provide opportunity to reduce the longwall move time by having a place where the mining equipment will be removed, prepared (supported) before the longwall

approaches the end of the panel. In cases such as the Emerald mine, the concept can also provide improved ground control. The weak shale roof in the Pittsburgh seam can be difficult to control in high stress environments such as those created when the longwall face is recovered. Screen and fabric mesh are typically installed to help control the immediate roof and prevent gob flushing into the face area as the shields are recovered. Problems have been experienced in the past with installing this mesh during the recovery operation as the damaged immediate roof would loosen and create cavities that impeded support advance during the final stages of the panel extraction and development of the recovery room. A pre-driven recovery room alleviates these problems by allowing the mesh and other support elements to be installed under conditions that are more benign and less hazardous to the mine workers.

However, the pre-driven recovery room must be adequately supported to ensure success. Failure to provide adequate ground control will create an extremely hazardous environment and can lead to catastrophic results with injuries to mine workers and loss of mining equipment. History has shown that it is very difficult to provide adequate support without the use of standing support to help control the large span of roof as the room is mined into (Oyler et al., 1998 and 2001). Since the longwall shields must advance far enough into the room to allow removal, a requirement for the standing supports is that they must be cut by the longwall shearer so they can be easily removed as part of this process. The yielding of the last section of the longwall panel due to abutment stresses produces a component of convergence that is uncontrollable, requiring the standing supports to be able to yield accordingly and maintain support capability until the shields are fully into the room. Here too, history has shown that supports that are too stiff and non-yielding, despite their high capacity, fail prematurely and endanger ground control (Tadolini et al., 2002).

These requirements have caused Emerald to utilize a pumpable roof support system for the recovery application in combination with roof bolts, cable bolts, slings, meshing, and straps. Although the intrinsic support is necessary to build an immediate roof beam that helps support the main roof, movement above the bolted horizon is common, and the standing support can be the most critical component of the support system. The pumpable support used in this case was a 30-in-diameter cementitious support in which the grout is pumped into an empty, reinforced fabric bag that is hung from the roof of the recovery room. The bag provides a containment form for filling the support, but more importantly,

provides confinement of the cementitious grout to supply a sustainable residual support capacity after the grout is fractured and the peak support loading is exceeded due to the yielding of the longwall panel fender. This capability to provide residual loading is advantageous, particularly compared to conventional concrete cribs which do not have a useful residual load capacity. However, the pumpable supports are very stiff, and unlike conventional concrete cribs, do not use wood to soften their response. Therefore, their residual load performance is the key to their effectiveness in this application. One of the objectives of this study was to acquire additional data on loading response of the pumpable supports during the panel fender yielding and advancement of the face into the recovery room.

Although other studies of pre-driven longwall recovery room operations have been conducted, questions regarding the loading mechanics and support design requirements remained unanswered as evidenced by premature support failures (Tadolini et al., 2002), roof falls, and loss of shields (Oyler et al., 1998), while other operations were successful (Wynne et al., 1993). One local roof fall and excessive roof sag occurred at the completion of the previous (B3) panel at this mine using this same recovery room design and support plan with only minor differences.

The objective of this study is to develop a better understanding of the loading mechanics associated with pre-driven longwall recovery room operations so that optimum support techniques can be applied and more effective support systems can be designed to reduce the risk of failure. The level of instrumentation used in this study was more extensive than previous studies and provides rare information to fulfill this objective.

## SITE DESCRIPTION AND RECOVERY ROOM INSTRUMENTATION PROFILE

The approach utilized at the Emerald mine is a hybrid design in that the recovery room is only partially (50 pct) pre-driven. A 16-ft wide entry at the end of the panel is pre-driven and supported long before the face approaches. After the face mines into the pre-driven room, the room is widened an additional 16 ft to provide sufficient room for the recovery of the longwall equipment.

The B4 longwall panel was 1,450 ft wide. The depth of cover averaged 600 ft. Figure 1 shows the roof lithology from two coreholes near the B4 recovery area. The immediate roof consists of clay shale, silty shale and rider coal, which is common to the Pittsburgh seam providing a relatively weak immediate roof structure. The area is overlain by 10 and 22-ft thick limestone members and 11 and 25-ft thick shale layers as shown in figure 1.

Figure 2 shows the support design for the recovery room. The recovery room was supported with 8-ft, grade 75, combination bolts. Combination bolts were also angled over the longwall panel and the outby pillar ribs to provide additional support as the face cuts into and then widens the recovery room. Eight-ft cable bolts on 4-ft spacing were installed 2 ft from the panel rib to help support the roof when the first row of cribs were cut out, and 12-ft cable bolts on 4-ft spacing were installed 2 ft from the pillar rib to reinforce the roof from possible shear/tension fractures. The roof was glued with polyurethane resin (PUR) on the outby (pillar) side to strengthen the roof in the area adjacent to the pumpable cribs. The mine chose not to use PUR on the inby side, as was done on the previous panel, to facilitate caving of the immediate roof once the shields entered the room.

Three rows of 30-in-diameter pumpable roof supports were utilized in the recovery room as shown in figure 2. These were Calcium-Sulfo-Aluminate (CSA) grout filled supports that are identical to the supports used for the longwall tailgate except the spiral metal wire in the bag was replaced with a fiberglass wire that could be more easily cut by the longwall shearer. The performance characteristics of this support, as measured in the laboratory through full-scale testing in the NIOSH Mine Roof Simulator and during the longwall recovery in this study are shown in figure 3. As seen, the pumpable support is very stiff with peak load occurring at less than 0.5 in of displacement. The support sheds load during yielding as the bag acts to provide confinement and maintain a residual loading capacity.




Figure 1. Geological columns in the longwall recovery area.



- Sonic probes were used to measure roof deformation up to 24 ft into the roof.
- Three-point mechanical extensometers attached to displacement transducers were used to measure roof deformation relative to the 26, 32, and 38 ft roof horizons.
- Convergence rods with displacement measuring transducers were used to measure roof-to-floor convergence in the recovery room and in the outby C chute adjacent to the stress measurement locations.
- Borehole Pressure Cells were used to measure panel and outby pillar stress development in the C chute area. Figure 4 depicts the location of the cells. One cell was installed in the panel 10-ft from the recovery room to measure yielding of the panel fender as the longwall face approached, two cells were installed in the outby pillars at a depth of 10-ft and two other cells 20-ft from the from the outby edge of the recovery room to measure load transfer from the panel to the outby pillars. Two more cells were installed 26-ft from the outby edge of the recovery room in the adjacent pillar of the C chute location, again to measure load transfer from the longwall panel as the fender yielded.




Figure 4. Diagram showing instrumentation in the longwall recovery room.

## SUPPORT AND GROUND RESPONSE DURING MINING PHASES

An evaluation of the support and ground response is made according to the progression of the mining process in the following order: (1) mining of the longwall panel to observe front abutment effects prior to yielding of the panel fender, (2) extraction of the remaining 25 ft of the panel to evaluate yielding of the panel fender, (3) removal of the standing supports and advancement through the pre-driven recovery room, and (4) widening of the pre-driven recovery room.

### Mining of the Longwall Panel Prior to Fender Yielding

The effects of the front abutment pressure began to manifest in the recovery room with increased pumpable support loading when the face was approximately 100 ft away. The increase in loading rate remained very gradual until the face was approximately 25 ft from the recovery room. Overall, the three instrumented pumpable supports increased in load by 90 kips (panel side support), 63 kips (middle row support), and 77 kips (pillar side support) during this period, representing 21%, 23%, and 35% of the observed peak loading on the supports.

An interesting discovery was revealed concerning the development of the pumpable support loading in response to the panel mining. The pumpable support loads were well correlated to the shield cycles even when the face was 100 ft away from the recovery room. The support loading increased rapidly as the shearer passed the face location adjacent to the support location in the recovery room, with very little load increase during the remainder of the shield cycle although the leg pressures were increasing significantly throughout the shield cycle. As expected, the shields are responding to the immediate roof and the main roof activity while the recovery room supports at this juncture are seeing




Figure 5. Correlation between pumpable support load and shield cycle showing load increase during shearer passage.




Figure 6. Correlation between borehole pressure cells and shield cycles.

the main roof activity. Figure 5 shows an example for shield number 175 (adjacent to Chute C in the recovery room) as the face advanced from a location 75 away to 50 ft away the recovery room. As the face advanced closer than the 50 ft location, the pumpable supports began to increase in loading during the full shield cycle, but the majority of the load increase continued to be consistent with the shearer passage and a step-type function in the load development continued.

The Borehole Pressure Cells (BPCs) monitoring the panel and pillar stress followed a similar pattern, although not as distinct as the support loads (see figure 6). Part of this was due to the much

slower sampling rate of the BPC data (10 minutes compared to 15 seconds). Similar increases in stress were measured in the panel BPC (positioned 10 ft from the leading or inby edge of the recovery room as shown in figure 4) and the pillar BPCs (positioned 10 ft from the trailing or outby edge of the recovery room) as the face advanced to the 50-ft location. However, as the face continued to advance toward the recovery room, the panel BPC increased at a much faster rate than the pillar BPCs as shown in figure 7. This suggests that the abutment load was focused on the panel and not transferred across the recovery room to outby pillars during this phase of the mining process.




Figure 7. Stress on the panel BPC began to increase at a faster rate than the pillar BPC as the face advanced closer to the recovery room.




Figure 8. When the longwall face was approximately 16 ft inby the recovery room, the pumpable support loading increased during the full shield cycle.

### Yielding of the Panel Fender as Face Approached the Recovery Room

As the face advanced within the 25-ft location from the recovery room, the ground and support responses began to change dramatically, again revealing several interesting observations. Prior to this, the abutment effects were almost totally caused by the shearer passage. Now, more localized behavior, was causing the support loads and panel stress to increase during the full shield cycle (see figure 8). The pumpable supports, panel BPC, and longwall shields all yield during this period as the load capacity of the panel fender is exceeded. The sequence of events that describe the load mechanics are as follows:

1. Panel BPC yields – The BPC in the longwall panel located 10 ft from the leading (inby) edge of recovery room measuring change in stress as the longwall face approached began to increase in loading rate when the face was approximately 25 ft away from the recovery room or 15 ft from the BPC position. The pressure in the cell increased from 2,100 psi at the 25-ft location to approximately 5,300 psi when the face was 16 ft from the recovery room or just 6 ft from the BPC. During the next shield cycle, the change in pressure reached a maximum of 7,500 psi, and then dropped to about 5,750 psi at the end of the shield cycle. At the time when the cell was cut out by the shearer, the cell pressure was approximately 4,200 psi.

The shield leg pressures provide further insight into the loading mechanisms associated with the panel fender yielding. The panel stress measurements are located adjacent to the C Chute location and shield number 175 (see figure 4), which is about 1,000 ft from the headgate on

this 1,450 ft-long face. For bidirectional cutting, the shield cycles are likely to alternate between short and long cycles since the support is located away from the center of the panel where the shield cycle time differential would be minimized. As shown in figure 9, the panel fender yielded during a long cycle (114-minute duration) as the shearer had to move to the headgate and back to complete the loading cycle. It was somewhat surprising to observe that the peak stress occurred not when the shearer passed by this location, but when the shearer was over 1,000 ft away at the headgate, particularly given the close proximity of the longwall face to the stress cell (approximately 6 ft away). This could be the result of the time dependent properties of the coal, in which the highly stressed coal will continue to deform (strain) even under static load conditions. The unloading rate is also nearly the same as the loading rate during this shield cycle. The detail of the loading is magnificent as exemplified by the temporary stop in load shedding when the shearer passes back in front of the pressure cell (see figure 9).

One question is whether the yielding of the BPC cell located 10 ft from the edge of the recovery room indicates that the remainder of the panel fender has also yielded. Here, too, the shield data provides valuable information. Analysis of the shield data suggests that the panel fender has not yet yielded. The shield data (see figure 8) shows that on the cut immediately following the BPC yielding, the shield loading behavior is similar to that observed prior to the yielding of the BPC, while on the next cut, the shield load increases quickly after the shield is set and reaches yield load without the shearer being in the immediate vicinity.

- Pillar fender BPCs shed load – The stress cells installed in the outby pillar rib (10 ft from the edge of the recovery pillar room) also increased in concert with the panel stress cell. This indicates that some of the abutment stress is transferring across the recovery room, but the magnitude of the stress change is much less in the pillar than in the panel.

These two cells peak and then gradually shed load during the shearer passage on the shield cycle following the peak loading of the panel cell (figure 10). Since the stress levels on the pillar cells were only 25% of the level that caused yielding of the panel cell, it is unlikely that the coal pillar at the cell location was actually yielding due to loading




Figure 9. Yielding of panel BPC occurred when the longwall shearer was approximately 1,000 ft away from the cell location.




Figure 10. Evaluation of load shedding associated with pumpable supports and BPCs measuring panel and pillar stress.

beyond the coal strength during this load shedding event. However, some rib spalling did occur to a depth of 2-3 ft.

3. Yielding of the shields and pumpable roof supports – The pumpable roof supports in the recovery room continue to develop load as the panel and pillar BPCs shed load as previously described. The pumpable supports yield two shield cycles after the panel BPC yields and one cycle after the pillar BPC sheds load (see figure 10), putting the yield of the supports at a face position of approximately 10 ft. The shields also yield during this cycle. Again, the nature of the shield loading provides insight into the load mechanics. After being set, the shield-loading rate is significantly higher than on previous shield cycles and the shields quickly reach their rated capacity and begin to yield. They continue to yield even though the shearer is moving away from the shields toward the headgate in a long shield cycle. The shields continue to yield for the next two cycles as the face mines into the recovery room. This behavior suggests that the panel fender yielded as the shearer cut was reducing the face position from the 10 ft location to approximately 7 ft.

The yielding of the pumpable supports trigger roof movements and convergence in the recovery room before the face even gets there. The pumpable roof supports are very stiff supports, capable of developing over 400 kips (200 tons) of load capacity in less than 0.5 in of displacement. Prior to the yielding of the pumpable supports, the roof remained intact as a composite structural unit without additional separation among rock layers. As the pumpable supports began to rapidly increase load while the panel fender was yielding (see figure 10), the data indicates that roof was moving slightly “upward” as shown in figure 11. This apparent “upward” movement is most likely compression of the immediate roof structure or closing of preexisting fractures along bedding planes or elsewhere within the first 26 ft of roof. Since the support requires

compression to build load, it is also possible that the floor ahead of the panel fender in the recovery room was also moving upward (heaving) as the panel fender yielded.

Another performance characteristic of the pumpable support is once the peak loading is exceeded by fracturing of the cementitious grout, the support also sheds considerable load very quickly with little additional displacement. This rapid relaxation of the support load immediately caused a change in the roof activity in which separations and deformations of the roof structure begin to rapidly occur as shown in figure 12. At the C chute located approximately 1,000 ft from the headgate, the roof structure above 26 ft remained largely intact with only minor separations (approximately 0.1 in) occurring above the 26-ft horizon. Similar roof responses were measured at the G chute location (approximately 450 ft from the headgate), however at the F chute, roof deformations occurred beyond the 32-ft horizon.

The roof-to-floor convergence also increased dramatically with the yielding of the pumpable supports. By the time the face mined into the recovery room, the convergence measured from the middle row support displacement reached 5 in, while the roof deformation at this time was approximately 1.2 in. This indicates that about 75% of the convergence was from floor heave and/or main roof yielding beyond the 38-ft horizon during the panel fender yielding. Figure 13 shows the relative ground movement in the recovery room and in the C chute area.

### Removal of Standing Supports and Advancement through the Pre-Driven Recovery Room

The next phase of the mining operation was to cut out the pumpable supports and advance the face to the pillar line to prepare for widening of the face. During this phase, no coal was being mined, however since the pumpable supports were helping to control the roof span and deformation process, the removal of the




Figure 11. Roof initially is compressed during yielding of panel fender and then begins to deform downward into the recovery room.






Figure 12. Roof deformations and convergence profile during pumpable support loading and failure.




Figure 13. Convergence and roof deformation profiles in C Chute area of recovery room.

supports can be critical to the stability of the recovery room. At the C chute location, the shield loading decreased as the supports were extracted and the face advanced toward the pillar line (see figure 14). As the first row of supports was being extracted, the shield loading remained high but below the yield rating. As the second row of pumpable supports was being extracted, the shield loading did not change much after being set and this condition remained throughout the advancement through the pre-driven recovery room. The pillar stress, as measured by the cells at both the 10-ft and 20-ft

locations from the edge of the recovery room, remained fairly constant during this process. The roof continued to deform slightly in the chute as measured by a three-point extensometer in the center of the entry located 16 ft from the outby edge of the pre-driven recovery room, but the deformations were nearly an order of magnitude less than that seen in the recovery room. An additional 1 in of closure occurred for a distance of about 20 ft in the C chute crosscut as measured by electronic closure meters measuring roof-to-floor displacement (see figure 13).

The time-weighted average shield pressure varied across the longwall face during the phase of mining in which the supports were cut out and the face was advanced through the pre-driven recovery room. This is shown in figure 15, which plots the change in shield loading (difference between the time-weighted average pressure and the setting pressure), as the last row of supports were being extracted and the face advanced to the pillar line. The shield loading at some locations was considerably higher than that observed at the three instrumentation sites. One example is shown in figure 16, where shield number 185 yielded on all cycles during the extraction of the pumpable supports and advancement through the pre-driven recovery room compared to shield 175 which had little change in loading during and following the extraction of the last row of supports. There was no obvious visual physical difference in the recovery room condition. Without

instrumentation, it is difficult to determine with certainty what causes this difference in behavior. The persistent yielding of the shields indicates there was considerably more closure at these locations. This could be caused by: (1) longer cantilever of main roof indicative of periodic weighting, (2) less control of the immediate roof structure allowing deformation to greater heights into the roof, or (3) greater yielding of the pillar due to the abutment stress.

### Widening of the Pre-Driven Recovery Room

The next phase of the recovery process was to widen the room by extracting an additional 16 ft of the coal pillars to create sufficient room to recover the longwall equipment. This phase




Figure 14. Shield loading decreased as the pumpable supports were extracted from the longwall recovery room.




Figure 15. Shield loading was low but did vary across the face during and after the extraction of the pumpable supports.

requires a variation in the typical longwall mining process in that extensions are included to the face conveyor advance rams to allow advancement of the shearer and cutting of the last portion of the pillar without advancement of the supports. The mesh was deployed and exposed roof was bolted after each cut to provide a fully supported room for recovery. The shields developed little, if any, loading during the extraction of the pillars to widen the room. On several occasions, the shields struggled to maintain set pressure, with the positive set control feature activating to re-supply pump

pressure periodically during the shield cycle. This behavior indicated that the immediate area is largely destressed. What would cause this? One possibility is that the front abutment loading on the pillars has dissipated or has been pushed well ahead of the face area.

The BPCs located in the pillar at depths of 10 ft and 20 ft from the recovery room again document the impact of the shearer passage on the loading mechanics. As the face cuts to the 10 ft




Figure 16. Comparison of two shields, one with high shield loading and one with low shield loading, during and after pumpable support removal.




Figure 17. Outby pillar pressure cells show effects of shearer advance as pillar is extracted to widen room.

location, the measured pressure change in the cells located there spiked to 2,852 psi and then shed load rapidly as the cell and/or contact condition is damaged from the shearer activity. As seen in figure 17, the pillar stress measured at the 20 ft locations increased with each shearer passage and remained fairly constant once the shearer cut was made until the next mining cycle. Overall, the load increments were much smaller than that observed with the panel fender yielding. These pillars do not yield. The convergence measured from the electronic convergence meters also continued to increase during the pillar extraction at about the same rate as when the pre-driven room was mined through (see figure 13). As the extraction approached the location of the convergence rods, the convergence rate increased significantly as expected.

## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND UNEXPECTED DISCOVERIES

1. Panel fender pressures – The BPC in the panel recorded a maximum pressure change of nearly 7,500 psi. This was higher than expected given the overburden and proximity of the BPC to the panel edge at the time the peak stress was measured. The depth of cover was approximately 600 ft at this location. Assuming an abutment stress of 3-5 times the insitu stress, this provides an abutment stress of 1,800 to 3,000 psi. Furthermore, the cell was only about 6 ft from the longwall face when this pressure was recorded. As such, the confinement provided by the yield zone was relatively small, and it was not expected that it would be sufficient to develop stress readings that were 2.5-4.2 times the abutment stress. Mark and Iannacchione (1992) indicated that BPC instruments tend to read significantly higher (by as much as a factor of 2) than vibrating wire instruments which correlate better to pillar strength formulas. This could account for the apparently high reading, although applying a reduction factor would also result in very low stress on the pillar side. It should also be noted that none of the measurements in Mark and Iannacchione's study were in fender pillar applications. Measurement of panel stress change during advancement into a full-width pre-driven recovery room in a previous study at this mine were typically around 2,500 psi (Oyler et al., 2001), again with vibrating wire stress gages.
2. Difference in panel stress and pillar stress – The expected load transfer mechanics is for the front abutment stress to transfer from the panel to the outby pillars as the panel fender yields and is no longer able to sustain load. The pillar cells located 10 ft from the recovery room did show stress increase as the panel fender yielded, but the stress change of about 1,000 psi was much smaller than that seen in the panel cell which increased by nearly 7,500 psi. It was expected that the stress changes would be of similar magnitude to account for the load balance that must occur. Numerical modeling by Zhang and measurements taken in previous longwall studies support this expectation (Zhang et al., 2006 and Oyler et al., 2001). If the panel measurement is correct and the stress development in the pillars was indeed much smaller, this would suggest that the load was distributed over a greater area to reduce the stress. The measured pillar stress was similar to that measured in previous studies (Oyler et al., 2001).
3. Shedding of pillar stress – The increase in pillar stress, as measured by the first set of cells 10 ft from the pillar edge, was followed by a near equal shedding of stress in a relatively short time frame (one shield loading cycle) following the yielding of the panel fender. Since the same cells increase in pressure as the pillars are mined to widen the recovery room, the load shedding is not due to yielding of the coal. So what caused the pillar stress to decrease? It was postulated that the drop in stress is caused by a decrease in load caused by a reduction in span. Since the panel fender is no longer capable sustaining load, it implies that the rear "abutment" moves forward closer to the shield line causing the reduced span and drop in load. The lower load then explains the drop in pillar stress. This load shedding behavior has been observed in previous longwall recovery rooms which were not stable (Oyler et al., 2001). When the panel fender yields or abruptly loses its load carrying capacity, the abutment must transfer across the recovery room onto the pillars. This is a shock to the overall system which apparently produces significant changes in the loading mechanisms.
4. Lack of shield loading during widening of recovery room – The shield loading did not increase above the set pressure during the widening of the recovery room an additional 16 ft by extraction of the pillars. In many areas of the face, the shield pressure development was small once the pumpable supports were extracted. Again, this indicates that the face area was destressed and the abutment pressures were dissipated. This supports the rear abutment hypothesis postulated above.

## CONCLUSIONS

Front abutment pressures increase as the longwall face advances toward the recovery room. As the panel advances toward the recovery room, this pressure causes stress increase in the panel, the pumpable roof supports, and the outby pillars suggesting that the load is bridging across the recovery room prior to the yielding of the panel fender. These effects begin to occur when the face is approximately 100 ft away and gradually increase until the face is about 25 ft away, at which time the loading rates increase significantly. When the face is close enough such that strength of the panel fender is exceeded to the point where it can no longer support load, which in this case was about 10 ft, the yielding of the panel fender triggers a cascading sequence of events, which cause yielding of the shields and pumpable supports. The yielding of the pumpable supports in the recovery room then triggers another sequence of events in which the roof in the recovery room above the supports deforms downward and closure of the recovery room increases dramatically.

The shedding of the pillar stress is a significant discovery with potentially major consequences. The surprising event in this process was that the load shedding of the panel fender also coincided with stress shedding of the outby pillar stress (to a depth of at least 10 ft) and this occurred just prior to the yielding of the pumpable supports. First, the stress shedding of the pillar in itself is surprising, but if this is going to occur, the expectation is that the pumpable supports would yield prior to the stress shedding of the pillar stress. It is postulated that the cause of the stress shedding of the pillar may be due to advancement of the rear abutment toward the recovery room, thereby reducing the span that the main roof is bridging from the gob over the recovery room. The effect of this would be a reduction in main roof loading, thereby accounting for the reduction in pillar stress. While this may initially seem like a

good thing, the advancement of the rear abutment stress would be caused by a large amount of convergence close to or in the recovery room. Although the outby pillars may shed load, they are not yielding. Therefore, the convergence profile would be described as minimal at the pillar area and increasing quickly through the recovery room toward the panel (rear abutment). This bending of the strata can produce high tensile stresses in the immediate roof beam that can cause failure at the maximum bending moment somewhere over the outby pillars. If this stress would cause failure of the main roof beam, the weighting of this coupled with the large convergence could lead to catastrophic weighting and roof failure.

Obviously, this did not occur in this case. The room was stable and the supports were recovered without incident. Nonetheless, if this mechanism is indeed the process that is occurring, several significant design implications are revealed.

- Standing support is critical to achieving successful stability of recovery rooms, even in partially pre-driven recovery rooms such as these. The support must be able to control the immediate roof since it fails or separates above the bolted horizon, even with the application of cable bolts. Without them, the roof must span from the outby pillars to the longwall shields.
- Premature yielding of the standing supports can be very detrimental to the roof control process, particularly with supports that shed load upon yielding, as is the case with the pumpable supports used in this study. It appears that the standing supports can help to delay the process of the roof deformation and load shedding of the pillars, essentially by helping to control the roof span. Premature yielding would increase this span and place greater demand on the shields, but since the shields are already being pushed into persistent yielding during most of the shield cycle when the panel fender yields, there is little if any additional *work* that the shields can provide.
- The pre-yield capacity of the pumpable supports is *not* the issue; they would yield regardless of their capacity (within the design capability of these supports systems). The critical design parameter for the pumpable support is the residual load capacity and their ability to sustain residual loading until the longwall shields are fully advanced into the recovery room. The pumpable cribs used in this study are very stiff supports, reaching yield load at less than 0.5 in of convergence, shedding load rapidly after the cementitious grout strength is exceeded.
- Higher capacity shields are not likely to make much difference. The yielding of the panel fender transfers load beyond the capacity of any modern shield. However, poorly maintained shields, ones that have leaking leg cylinders, are likely to cause excessive convergence that can lead to failure of the arching capability of the main roof and collapse of the recovery room.

In conclusion, an understanding of the loading mechanisms associated with longwall recovery using pre-driven rooms is critical.

While safer from a roof support installation perspective, the concept of using a pre-driven room increases the risk of the equipment recovery, and a better understanding of the loading mechanisms can help to ensure that catastrophic weighting failures will not occur. Some surprising results were revealed in this study, particularly the load shedding of the pillar stress prior to the advancement of the longwall face into the recovery room and the largely distressed condition that existed during the widening of the room. It is recommended that additional studies be conducted to further evaluate the loading mechanics associated with pre-driven longwall recovery rooms. Numerical modeling by Zhang et al. (2006) did not show the load shedding of the pillar stress, indicating that the models are not yet fully simulating the loading conditions. Additional numerical modeling studies, perhaps using FLAC (Itasca, 2001) that can more accurately simulate the post failure rock behavior should be constructed to further study this problem. In addition, efforts to improve the loading characteristics of the pumpable supports should continue. Reducing the stiffness and/or load shedding as well as increasing the yield displacement and residual loading capacity should be pursued if this support is to continue to be used for longwall recovery rooms.

## REFERENCES

- Itasca (2001). User's Guide.
- Mark, C. and Iannacchione, A.T. (1992). Coal Pillar Mechanics: Theoretical Models and Field Measurements Compared. Proceedings of the Workshop on Coal Pillar Mechanics and Design, NIOSH Information Circular 9315, pp 78-93.
- Oyler, D.C., Frith, R.C., Dolinar, D.R. and Mark, C. (1998). International Experience with Longwall Mining into Pre-Driven Rooms. Proceedings of 17th International Conference on Ground Control in Mining, Morgantown, WV, pp 44-53.
- Oyler, D.C., Mark, C., Dolinar, D.R. and Frith, R.C., (2001). A Study of Ground Control Effects of Mining Longwall Faces into Pre-Driven Longwall Recovery Room. Geotechnical and Geological Engineering 19:137-168.
- Tadolini, S.C., Zhang, Y. and Peng, S. (2002). Pre-driven Experimental Longwall Recovery Room Under Weak Roof Conditions—Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. Proceedings of 21st International Conference on Ground Control in Mining, Morgantown, WV, pp 1-10.
- Wynne, T., John, S., Guo, S. and Peng, S.S. (1993). Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation of a Pre-driven Longwall Recovery Room. Proceedings of 12th International Conference on Ground Control in Mining, Morgantown, WV, pp 205-216.
- Zhang, P., Mishra, M., Trackemas, J., Zeglen, E., Huff, C., Peng, S.S. and Chen, J. (2006). Pre-Driven Longwall Recovery Room Under Weak Roof Conditions—Design, Evaluation, and Monitoring. Proceedings of 25th International Conference on Ground Control in Mining, Morgantown, WV, pp 221-228.